



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,937	05/10/2001	David M. Blaker	9269-5	5828
20792	7590	04/11/2005	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,937	BLAKER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin E Lanier	2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 16-23 and 27-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 16-23, 27-34 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that Moyer does not disclose coprocessors storing operands for use when executing an instruction is not persuasive because Moyer discloses the cryptographic processor loads an operand from system memory into local memory to execute an instruction using the operand (Col. 8, line 56 – Col. 9, line 8).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 16, 19, 21, 22, 27, 30, 32, 33 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 31, 59 of copending Application No. 09/852,562. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because A method of operating a cryptographic data processing system that comprises a host processor, a system memory coupled to the host processor, and a cryptographic processor integrated circuit that comprises a local memory and is coupled to the host process and the system memory, the method comprising:

loading at least one operand from the system memory to the local memory; performing at least one operation on the at least one operand to generate a result in the local memory; and storing the result generated in memory. The difference being that the result in the instant application is stored at a second relative position in the local memory whereas the result in the '562 reference is stored in system memory.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-8, 16-23, 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moyer, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,647. Referring to claims 1, 6, 16, 21, 27, 32, Moyer discloses a method for interfacing a host processor, with memory (Fig. 1), and a co-processor, with memory (Abstract & Fig. 1), wherein the co-processor is a cryptographic processor (Col. 1, lines 45-48), which meets the limitation of operating a cryptographic system that comprises a host processor, a system memory coupled to the host processor, and a cryptographic processor integrated circuit that comprises a local memory and is coupled to the host processor and the system memory. The cryptographic processor loads an operand from system memory into local memory to execute an

instruction using the operand (Col. 8, line 56 – Col. 9, line 8), which meets the limitation of loading at least one operand from the system memory to the local memory and executing an instruction using the cryptographic processor that references the at least one operand using a first relative position in the local memory.

Referring to claims 2, 17, 28, Moyer discloses moving several operands into memory (Col. 12, lines 49-63), which meets the limitation of loading at least one operand from the system memory to the local memory comprises at least two operands and executing the instruction using the cryptographic processor that references a first one of the operands using the first relative position in the local memory and a second one of the operands using a second relative position in the local memory, the first and second relative positions being contiguous with one another.

Referring to claims 3, 18, 29, Moyer discloses that the operands have different sizes (Col. 12, lines 13-14), which meets the limitation of the operands comprising a different number of bits.

Referring to claims 5, 8, 20, 23, 31, 34, Moyer discloses that the relative memory positions comprise an offset from a base address in the local memory (Col. 12, lines 53-57).

Referring to claims 4, 7, 19, 22, 30, 33, Moyer discloses producing an output as result of executing instructions and subsequently storing the output in memory (Col. 4, line 33 – Col. 5, line 12), which meets the limitation of generating a result based on the at least one operand and storing the result at a second relative position in the local memory.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 0 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Benjamin E. Lanier


GILBERTO BARRÓN Jr.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100